

## Tetra Tech

Former Station Yard, Moor Row Proposed Residential Development Access Arrangements



Stage 1 Road Safety Audit



| REPORT CONTROL        |  |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Document              | Stage 1 Road Safety Audit  |   |  |  |
| Project               | Former Station Yard, Moor Row Proposed Residential Development – Access Arrangements |   |  |  |
| Client                | Tetra Tech   |   |  |  |
| Report Number         | NS22/788/RSA1  |   |  |  |
| <b>Primary Author</b> | Kevin Nicholson  |   |  |  |
| Reviewer              | Nancy Sloan  | \ |  |  |

# REVISION HISTORY

| Issue | Date     | Status   | Checked for Issue  |  |
|-------|----------|--|--|--|
| 1     | 03/11/22 | Issued to Client   |  |  |
| 2     | 11/11/22 | Update following minor drawing amendments and issued to Client |  |  |
| 3     | 25/06/23 | Update following drawing amendments and issued to Client       |  |  |
| 4     | 08/09/23 | Update following drawing amendments and issued to Client       | , and a second s |  |



## CONTENTS

| 1. | INTRODUCTION                                   | 1 |
|----|--|---|
|    |  |   |
| 2. | ITEMS RAISED BY PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDITS    | 3 |
| 3. | ITEMS RAISED BY THIS STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT | 4 |
| 1  | AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT                           |   |
| 4. | AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT                           |   |
| 5. | DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS PROVIDED                | 6 |
| 6. | LOCATION PLAN OF ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT    | 7 |



### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on the vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements associated with a proposed residential development of up to 80 units at the former Station Yard, Moor Row. Briefly, the improvements comprise the following:
  - a new access road with footways forming a simple priority junction with the east side of Dalzell Street;
  - > a section of shared footway/cycleway between the development and the 30mph/national speed limit boundary to the north;
  - > a system of speed cushions on Dalzell Street on the northbound approach to the new junction;
  - footway/cycleway connections between the development and NCN 72 and to also provide access to Moor Row without having to use the existing bridge;
  - > amendment of the existing nearside white lining to the north of 66 Dalzell Street to accommodate a speed cushion.
- 1.2. The Road Safety Audit was requested by Eleanor Bunn of Tetra Tech and was carried out during September 2023. The purpose of this latest Stage 1 Audit is to consider recent design changes that include the proposed footway/cycleway connection between the development and the speed limit boundary and the removal of the earlier proposal to install a footway across the bridge between the development and the village.
- 1.3. The Audit Team membership was as follows: -

Nancy Sloan Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited (Audit Team Member).

- 1.4. The Audit Team had previously visited the site together on the afternoon of Monday 31 October 2022, during which the weather was cool with light cloud, and the road surfaces were damp following earlier rain. Traffic was light and free flowing, and a number of pedestrians were observed. In the vicinity of the works, Dalzell Street is subject to a 30mph speed limit and is unlit.
- 1.5. An investigation of the Crashmap database has revealed that there were no recorded collisions in the vicinity of the proposed works in the 5-year period 2017 to 2021 inclusive.
- 1.6. The terms of reference for this audit are as described in GG 119 (Revision 2) in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The Team has reported only on the road safety implications of the proposals and has not examined or verified the compliance of the design to any other criteria. However, and



without being prescriptive, the Audit Team might refer to a design standard or technical guidance where this would help to clarify a safety problem or recommendation. In addition, there may be alternative methods of addressing a problem that would be equally acceptable in achieving the elimination or mitigation of a problem, and these should be considered in the light of the recommendations in this report.

- 1.7. The detail provided for the audit is shown in Section 5. All comments and recommendations are referenced to the design drawings and related documents and the locations of the items raised by the audit are shown on the plan in Section 6.
- 1.8. Where relevant within this report traffic signs will be described either by their reference numbers on the drawings or by their diagram number within the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD).
- 1.9. Within this report the generic term "pedestrians" can include walking pedestrians, wheelchair users, mobility scooter users, dismounted cyclists, the blind, partially sighted and mobility impaired. Reference may be made to specific groups where appropriate.
- 1.10. Some items in Section 3 refer to issues that might usually be raised as part of a Stage 2 (detailed design) Road Safety Audit. However, notwithstanding that this is a Stage 1 Audit, those issues are raised in order that they can be given due consideration as the detailed design progresses.



### 2. ITEMS RAISED BY PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDITS

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was carried out in November 2022 on a previous revision of the proposals, and an updated report following further revisions was carried out in June 2023. All of the problems raised in the resulting reports were accepted in the respective Designer's Responses dated 22 November 2023 and 26 June 2023 and have either been included in the latest revision of the Access Arrangement drawing or will be addressed at the detailed design stage. As a result, four of the five problems raised in the original report are considered to be closed. However, the response regarding the problem relating to dropped kerbs and tactile paving are not shown on Revision P07 of the Access Arrangements (currently subject to audit). It should be noted that tactile paving is installed primarily to inform visually impaired pedestrians of the absence of a full height kerb (and thus that they are at the edge of the carriageway), but those users usually expect to find a corresponding arrangement on the opposite side of the road (that is, a crossing point). However, the proposed footway/cycleway has a single access (and egress) point only so, on balance, dropped kerbs only should be provided. This problem has therefore been reworded and included within this report as Problem 3.1.



### ITEMS RAISED BY THIS STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

#### 3.1 PROBLEM

Location: The northern end of the proposed footway/cycleway between the development and the speed limit boundary.

Summary: The absence of dropped kerbs could lead to pedestrians tripping and falling.

At this stage, dropped kerbs are not present on the northern end of the footway/cycleway. Providing dropped kerbs could reduce the risks both of physically impaired pedestrians tripping and of wheelchair users being stranded or of overturning.

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that dropped kerbs are specified for the northern end of the footway/cycleway on Dalzell Street.

3.2 Location: The proposed footway/cycleway between the development and the speed limit boundary.

Summary: The absence of traffic signs could result in conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.

Appropriate shared facility signing will help to inform pedestrians of the likelihood of encountering cyclists and reduce the risk of collisions. Direction signs could also be provided to help to guide pedestrians and cyclists through the development to access NCN 72 and reduce the risk of conflicts with vehicles on the bridge to the south.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the entry point to the footway/cycleway is signed for to indicate its use by both pedestrians and cyclists (Diagram 956 if the facility is unsegregated). In addition, the opportunity could be taken to provide signs guiding users towards NCN 72.

#### 3.3 PROBLEM

Location: The accesses to NCN 72 from the development.

Summary: The absence of warning signs could increase the risk of collisions.

At this stage, there are no signs specified to inform users leaving the development of the presence of NCN 72 and of the likelihood of encountering cyclists. Providing signs could reduce the risk of collisions involving cyclists on NCN 72.

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that appropriate signs are specified as the detailed design progresses.



### 4. AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

We certify that this Road Safety Audit has been carried out in accordance with GG 119.

#### **ROAD SAFETY AUDIT TEAM LEADER**

Kevin Nicholson BSc, CMaths, MCIHT, FSoRSA,

HE Certificate of Competency Signed:

Director, Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited

Cherry Tree Cottage Date: 08/09/23

Hayton, Brampton, Cumberland, CA8 9HT

**ROAD SAFETY AUDIT TEAM MEMBER** 

Nancy Sloan MCIHT, MSoRSA Signed:

Director, Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited

Cherry Tree Cottage Date: 08/09/23

Hayton, Brampton, Cumberland, CA8 9HT



### 5. DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS PROVIDED

| DRAWING OR DOCUMENT<br>NUMBER                   | PROJECT AND TITLE  | DATE     |
|---|--|----------|
| 784-B041101-TTE-00-XX-DR-O-0001<br>REVISION P07 | FORMER STATION YARD, MOOR ROW<br>ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS         | 07.09.23 |
| 784-B041101<br>REVISION 2                       | STATION YARD, MOOR ROW<br>TRANSPORT STATEMENT                | 20.06.23 |
| 784-B041101<br>ISSUE 2                          | DESIGNER'S RESPONSE TO STAGE 1 RSA AT STATION YARD, MOOR ROW | 26.06.23 |



### 6. LOCATION PLAN OF ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT

